Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/740,033	CERNY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Phallaka Kik	2825
All Participants:	Status of Application: pending	
(1) <u>Phallaka Kik</u> .	(3)	
(2) Johnathan T. Kaplan (Reg. No. 38,935).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 8 February 2006	Time: <u>11 AM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 1-23		
Prior art documents discussed: None		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
J. hallate Mil	Annlicant's Penresentative Si	ifi

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On January 20, 2006, in response to the the Examiner's earlier message on Applicant's answering machine, indicating that the claims are subjected to a requirement restriction, wherein group I invention, claims 1,3-4,6,20,22 is drawn to electromagnetic waveform/method/computer program for performing formal verification of a representation of an electronic design of an IC, classified in class 716, subclass 5 and group II invention, claims 2,5,7-19,21,23, is drawn to electromagnetic waveform/method/computer program for performing simulation verification involving conversion steps, classified in class 716, subclass 3, wherein the inventions are related to each other as being subcombinations usable together but could have separate ultilities, and would further require separate searches; Applicant's Representative elected group II invention with traverse.

On February 8, 2006, in response to the Examiner's earlier indication on 2/2/2006, that the elected claims are allowable except for minor informalities to claims 2,7,21 and minor informalities to the specification, including the abstract, Applicant's Representative authorizes the Examiner to amend the claims and the specification, including the abstract as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment. In addition, since the non-elected claims 1,3-4,6,20,22 were orally elected with traverse, Applicant's Representative also authorizes the Examiner to cancel these claims as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment so that the application can be passed to issue.